



U.S. AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT

December 17, 1998

MEMORANDUM FOR AFR/SD, Jerome M. Wolgin, Director

FROM: *for Thomas B. Conner*
IG/A/PA, David M. Conner

SUBJECT: Audit of the Quality of Results Reported by the Africa Bureau's Office of Sustainable Development in Its Results Review and Resource Request Report Prepared in 1997 (Audit Report No. 9-000-99-003-P)

This memorandum is our report on the subject audit. In preparing this report, we considered management's written comments on our draft report and included them as Appendix II.

Based upon your comments to the draft report, we have accepted your management decision on Recommendation No. 1.2. Information related to your final action on this recommendation should be provided to USAID's Office of Management Planning and Innovation. However, we do not concur with your position on Recommendation No. 1.1, and therefore a management decision has not been reached on this recommendation. Please provide this office with your final management decision on Recommendation No. 1.1 within 30 days of the date of this report.

I appreciate the courtesies and cooperation extended to my staff during the audit.

Background

Passage of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Results Act), among other things, was intended to improve the effectiveness of federal programs and public accountability by promoting a new focus on results. The General Accounting Office (GAO) noted that key steps in building a successful results-oriented organization include collecting and using performance information in the decision process.¹ Congress also recognized, in the Results Act, that agency managers need performance information to facilitate decisions leading to programs that meet intended goals. GAO also noted that successful implementation of the Results Act is dependent on good information for decision purposes. In this regard, we adopted five characteristics of what we believe is good management information: objectively verifiable, supported, accurate, complete, and validated.

Since USAID was established in 1961, it has initiated numerous systems to report on program results. However, none of these systems have been fully successful. Over the past several years,

¹ GAO report, "Executive Guide: Effectively Implementing the Government Performance and Results Act," GAO/GGD-96-118, June 1996.

the Office of Inspector General (OIG) has intermittently reported on weaknesses in USAID's ability to measure and report reliable program performance information. Examples of these audit reports include:²

- A June 1995 report identified that USAID needed better direction and control procedures to ensure that (1) objectively verifiable and measurable indicators are established to measure program performance and (2) reliable and useful performance data are reported and documented.
- A March 1998 report on USAID's fiscal year 1996 financial statements identified that 29 of 38 (76 percent) quantified results reported in the program performance section of the overview section were either incorrect, vague, or unsupported.
- Another audit report issued in March 1998 identified that 10 of 11 overseas missions reviewed either had not developed or finalized a formalized, ongoing system of data collection and verification to report good performance data.

In light of the problems reported, and our continuing concern that these conditions may be prevalent throughout USAID, the OIG decided to perform a USAID-wide audit to establish a baseline for future OIG audit work, to identify problems with current data reporting, and to develop recommendations for improving data quality. This audit was not intended to assess the quality of the performance indicators (subject of a future audit), but rather to determine if the performance results reported in the Results Review and Resource Requests (R4) by operating units were objectively verifiable, supported, accurate, complete and validated. This audit of the Africa Bureau's Office of Sustainable Development is one of 18 audits being done on a USAID-wide basis.

The R4 for the Africa Bureau's Office of Sustainable Development (AFR/SD) was reviewed by that bureau in April 1997, and included 44 indicators for which performance results (or baseline data) were reported for fiscal year 1996. We randomly selected 25 indicators for audit. As of September 30, 1996, AFR/SD had obligated and expended in support of its programs a total of \$35.5 million and \$21.5 million, respectively.

Audit Objective

The Office of Inspector General/Performance Audits, as part of an USAID-wide audit, performed the audit to answer the following question:

Did Africa Bureau's Office of Sustainable Development report results data in its Results Review and Resource Request prepared in 1997, which were objectively

² The examples are from Audit Report No. 1-000-95-006 (dated June 30, 1995), Audit Report No. 0-000-98-001-F (dated March 2, 1998), and Audit Report No. 9-000-98-001-P (dated March 26, 1998).

verifiable, supported, accurate, complete and validated?

Appendix I describes the audit's scope and methodology.

Audit Findings

Did Africa Bureau's Office of Sustainable Development report results data in its Results Review and Resource Request prepared in 1997, which were objectively verifiable, supported, accurate, complete and validated?

Of the 25 indicators included in our sample, 21 did not meet USAID's criteria regarding objective verification, and 3 other indicators were unsupported, and/or inaccurate. Our review of the indicators did not identify problems related to completeness or validity.

Federal laws and regulations require federal agencies to develop and implement internal management control systems that (1) compare actual program results against those anticipated; (2) provide for complete, reliable, and consistent information; and (3) ensure that performance information is clearly documented and that the documentation is readily available for examination. For example, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Bulletin 93-06 requires agencies to have internal control systems to provide reasonable assurance that support for reported performance results are properly recorded and accounted for to permit preparation of reliable and complete performance information. (See Appendix III for a further discussion of relevant laws and regulations as well as related USAID policies and procedures.)

For the purpose of this audit, we used the following definitions:

- *Objectively Verifiable*—This means the indicator has no ambiguity about what was being measured. That is, there was general agreement over interpretation of the results. The indicator was both unidimensional and operationally precise. To be unidimensional means that it measures only one phenomenon at a time. Operational precision means no ambiguity over what kind of data would be collected for an indicator.
- *Supported*—This means that there was adequate documentation that supports the reported result. The support should be relevant, competent, and sufficient (as noted in the General Accounting Office's Government Auditing Standards). For example, a memo of a telephone conversation, or "best guesses" would not be considered adequate documentation.
- *Accurate*—This means that the R4 result (a) was within plus-or-minus one percent of the actual documented result; and (b) was consistent with what was to be measured under the indicator. For example, if the indicator was to vaccinate children under 5 years of age and the support shows that the result was for children under 3 years of age, then the result would be inconsistent and, thus, inaccurate. The result also would be considered inaccurate if the result was achieved in a period other than calendar year 1996. (Note:

As we only reviewed results in the performance data tables for 1996, the result would not be considered accurate if supporting documents showed the result was achieved in 1992.)

- *Complete*—This means the result includes all data against what was anticipated to be measured for the indicator and was for a full year. For example, if 20 regions were to be measured but only 18 regions were measured, the result would be considered not complete. Also, if the results were only for a partial year (e.g., a six-month period), then the result would not be considered complete.
- *Validated*—This refers to the source of the data and the reliability of that source. We would consider the source reliable if it came from an independent source such as the World Bank, United Nations (U.N.), independent evaluators, or an independent Demographic and Health Survey. Data from a contractor involved with the program or the host country government would be considered unreliable unless USAID, or an independent entity, assessed the data and found it was reliable. (For purposes of this audit, we are not reviewing USAID's validation of independent sources. We plan to test USAID's validation of this external information in a subsequent audit.)

Our audit found problems with 24 of the 25 sampled performance results reported in the R4 for fiscal year 1996 (see Appendix IV). The problems were categorized as: not objectively verifiable, not supported, and not accurate. The following identifies the total problems found for each categorization and discusses the problems with selected examples.³

The following are examples of the 21 indicators whose results were not objectively verifiable.

- One indicator was the "[number] of improved structural policies, programs and strategies (SPP) for broad-based Economic Growth that are implemented by African partners, donors, and USAID missions" (Economic Table 1 of AFR/SD's R4). AFR/SD reported for fiscal year 1996 that four policies, programs and strategies were implemented. However, this indicator was not objectively verifiable because the R4 did not define or provide a baseline to measure "improved" policies, etc., or "broad-based" economic growth. The indicator is also not unidimensional because it attempts to measure three different conditions, "policies," "programs," and "strategies." AFR/SD also needed to be more precise in defining what it meant by "implementation," since the unfamiliar reader could have interpreted implementing as an initiating event or completion of the event or somewhere in between.

³ To avoid double counting the problems related to the reported results (e.g. report a result as both not supported and not accurate), we classified indicator results as having only one problem according to the following hierarchy: (1) not objectively verifiable, (2) not supported, (3) not accurate, and (4) not complete. We would, however, classify results as not validated (if applicable) in addition to another problem because we believe that the requirement for operating units to assess the quality of data sources was a distinct function and potentially related to each of the types of problems included in the hierarchy. Problems identified but not classified are also discussed under "Comments" in Appendix IV.

- Another indicator was "Countries and/or USAID missions adopt and/or implement national programs, policies or strategies to increase participation/remove constraints in commodity output markets" (Agriculture Table 13). The R4 reported six programs, policies or strategies were adopted and/or implemented. However, this indicator was not objectively verifiable because it attempted to measure mutually exclusive activities and was not unidimensional. In this instance, the indicator wants to know how many countries and/or USAID missions "adopt and/or implement" national programs, policies, or strategies. While USAID missions may be able to implement a strategy to affect national programs and policies, they cannot adopt or implement national programs or policies. As mentioned above, AFR/SD also needed to be more precise in defining what it meant by "implement," since the unfamiliar reader could have interpreted this in various ways.
- A third example is the indicator "Primary schools connected through low-cost, high quality internet services" (Education Table 4). The unit of measure was the number of countries. The R4 noted that AFR/SD had not achieved the indicator. Nonetheless, this indicator was not objectively verifiable because it did not provide a definition or baseline to objectively measure "low-cost" or "high quality" internet services. The indicator also should have defined "internet services," because the internet provides an array of services—email, mailing lists, World Wide Web, UseNet, File Transfer Protocol Sites, Gopher, and Telnet. In addition, the indicator did not specify how many schools needed to be connected to the internet in order to successfully achieve the indicator, e.g., one school or 100 schools.

The following is one example of the two indicators where the reported results were not supported.

- The indicator for Health Sector Reform Table 2 was "Public sector financing of private provision of public health care services" and the unit of measure was the number of countries. The R4 reported that one country had achieved the indicator, but there was no evidence that the achievement actually occurred. The documentary support, a feasibility study issued in December 1996, recommended public financing of public health care provided by the private sector, but there was no commitment from the government to fund these activities in calendar year 1996.

The following is the indicator where the reported results were not accurate.

- "[Environmental Management Capacity Building] workshops conducted and participants trained" (Environment and Natural Resources Table 5). The unit of measurement was the number of NGOs/PVOs and other host country agencies represented and the number of participants. The R4 reported that 33 NGOs, et al, were represented in FY 1996 workshops and a total of 150 people participated. However, the documentation indicates that 45 NGOs/PVOs/host country agencies were represented at the workshops and that 119 people participated. This represents an under reporting of 36 percent related to the NGOs, et al, and an over reporting of 26 percent related to the number of participants.

The above problems existed because AFR/SD did not always follow or was not successful in following prescribed USAID policies and procedures (Automated Directives System [ADS] 200 Series) for measuring and reporting on program performance. For example, AFR/SD:

- Did not ensure that 21 of the 25 sampled indicators were objectively verifiable as prescribed by ADS E203.5.5 and the supplemental guidance provided in TIPS No. 6.
- Did not always maintain documentation to support reported results as prescribed by ADS E203.5.5 and the supplemental guidance provided in TIPS No. 7.
- Did not always critically assess the performance data at regular intervals to ensure the data are of reasonable quality and accurately reflect performance (ADS 203.5.5e).

According to ADS E203.5.5, performance indicators should be objective and unidimensional. Further, TIPS No. 6 defines objective:

An objective indicator has no ambiguity about what is being measured. That is, there is general agreement over interpretation of the results. It is both unidimensional and operationally precise. To be *unidimensional* means that it measures only one phenomenon at a time. . . . *Operational precision* means no ambiguity over what kind of data would be collected for an indicator.

Further, ADS 203.5.5 requires the operating unit to establish a performance monitoring system to collect and analyze data which will enable it to assess its progress in achieving results. TIPS No. 7 recommends as a minimum that the system should: (1) provide a detailed definition of the performance indicators to be tracked; (2) specify the data source and its method and schedule of collection; and (3) assign responsibility for data collection to an office team or individual.

AFR/SD officials believed that for the indicators that were not objectively verifiable, the problems occurred because of their familiarity with the subject matter and the urgency to complete and issue the R4. Thus, at the time the indicators were written, the preparers were less sensitive to recognizing and correcting ambiguous and multi-dimensional indicators.

As for those indicators identified as not supported or not accurate, the primary causes were: (1) an over-reliance on support contractors or grantees to maintain data, and (2) recognizing the assistance effort as an achievement even though the indicator was intended to measure events subsequent to the assistance provided.

Without reliable performance data, decision makers have little assurance whether an operating unit met, exceeded or fell short in achieving its program objectives and related targets. In our opinion, the problems with performance indicators and reporting on performance also impair AFR/SD's and USAID management's ability to measure progress in achieving AFR/SD's program objectives and to use performance information in budget-allocation decisions. The problems also impair USAID's ability to comply with laws and regulations. AFR/SD officials

stated that this audit was a useful experience which would help them avoid the problems cited in developing their own indicators and in their reviews of those developed by USAID's African Missions.

Recommendation No. 1: We recommend that Africa Bureau's Office of Sustainable Development:

- 1.1 ensure its performance indicators in the R4 prepared in 1999 are objective and clearly defined regarding what specific results are to be measured; and
- 1.2 ensure that the performance data identified in its R4 prepared in 1999 are supported, accurate, complete, and validated; or fully disclose in the R4 any data limitations and their implications for assessing the measurement and achievement of performance targets for each performance indicator, and a timeframe for resolving the problems.

Management Comments and Our Evaluation

In responding to the draft report, AFR/SD management generally concurred with the findings and recommendation, but believed that they may not be able to implement Recommendation No. 1.1 because of insufficient lead time. Management said that it would implement Recommendation No. 1.2 to clarify indicator ambiguity and data limitations when necessary. While AFR/SD management states that now is not the best time for revising the indicators, it is important to note that they agreed that 21 of the 25 indicators were not objective. And, as noted in the report, performance indicators that are not objective impair USAID's ability to measure whether an operating unit achieved its program objectives. We do not believe that implementing only Recommendation No. 1.2 will adequately address the problem. Thus, AFR/SD needs to implement Recommendation No. 1.1 to assure itself, and others who also are relying on these measurements, that the measurements are meaningful.

AFR/SD management also was concerned that the report emphasized TIPS as an agency requirement when it is not. To the contrary, the report clearly states that TIPS is supplemental guidance. While offices are not completely bound by them, TIPS provide additional information to help offices develop, as in this case, indicators and performance monitoring systems. Because we did not believe the report was confusing in its use of TIPS we did not revise those references.

Based upon your comments to the draft report, we have accepted your management decision on Recommendation No. 1.2. Information related to your final action on this recommendation should be provided to USAID's Office of Management Planning and Innovation. However, we do not concur with your position on Recommendation No. 1.1, and therefore a management decision has not been reached on this recommendation. Please provide this office with your final management decision on Recommendation No. 1.1 within 30 days of the date of this report.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Scope

We audited Africa Bureau's Office of Sustainable Development's internal management controls for ensuring that it reported objectively verifiable, supported, accurate, complete, and validated performance results data in its Results Review and Resource Request (R4) report. (See pages 3 and 4 of this report for definitions). We audited only the results (including baseline data) reported for 1996 in the R4 prepared in 1997. The audit was performed in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards and was conducted at USAID/Washington from March 9, 1998, through September 8, 1998.

We limited our work on the quality of data to the performance indicators identified in the "performance data tables" in the R4 prepared in 1997 that had results claimed for 1996. Therefore, if no actual results for an indicator were shown for 1996, we did not assess the validity and reliability for the results for that indicator. We did not review results reported in the narrative portion of the R4.

We did not attempt to determine if the baseline data and the results reported for 1996 were consistent and based on comparable data.

Methodology

This audit is part of an USAID-wide audit. The Office of the Inspector General's Performance Audits Division in Washington, D.C. is the lead office. The Africa Bureau's Office of Sustainable Development (AFR/SD) was one of the 18 operating units reviewed in accordance with a random sample developed for the audit by statisticians from the Department of Defense's Office of Inspector General. That statistical plan also required that we randomly sample and review 25 of AFR/SD's 43 indicators that were applicable to the audit scope.

To accomplish the audit objective, we interviewed personnel from the Africa Bureau's Office of Sustainable Development and Office of Development Planning and reviewed the documents which supported the reported results. Where problems were found, we verified to the extent practical, the causes of the problems including additional interviews with operating unit personnel.

To avoid duplicating the problems related to the reported results (e.g. a reported result could be both not supported and not accurate), we classified indicator results as having only one problem according to the following hierarchy: not objectively verifiable, not supported, not accurate, and not complete. Where applicable, however, we classified results as not validated in addition to another problem because we believe that the requirement for operating units to assess the quality of data sources was a distinct function and potentially related to each of the types of problems included in the hierarchy. We did not assess whether a result was validated if the result was not objectively verifiable.

If the results reported for the indicators were found to be objectively verifiable, supported, accurate, complete and validated: (a) 95 percent or more of the time, (b) 80 to 94 percent of the time, or (c) less than 80 percent of the time, we would provide a positive, qualified, or negative answer to the audit question, respectively.



U.S. AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT

MEMORANDUM

November 19, 1998

TO: IG/A/PA, David Young
FROM: AFR/SD, Jerome Wolgin
SUBJECT: Response to Draft Audit Report of the Quality of
Results Reported by the Africa Bureau's Office of
Sustainable Development in its Results Review and
Resource Request Report Prepared in 1997

The IG has usefully and clearly reviewed the definitions, clarity and measurability of a sample of AFR/SD's performance indicators, and this review will be of great help as we refine our indicators this year. It is important to note that the R4 document used as the basis for the IG audit reported on 1996 performance and was prepared prior to our having a strategy in place. The definition and clarity problems identified by the audit resulted partly from the absence of a clearly articulated strategy with measurable results. During the course of preparing our new strategy which became operational in 1998, we corrected some of those problems, and are now reviewing our indicators again in light of this audit.

Related to the above, we have found that a single sentence indicator statement at times cannot explain fully what is being measured, and/or why the indicator has been stated in the way selected. A practice we have adopted and which we believe to be standard throughout the agency is to provide additional text in the performance monitoring plan and/or the R4 document which provides greater definition to indicators as necessary, and which would be referred to when one is trying to judge the appropriateness and adequacy of indicators.

We fully agree with the spirit of the recommendations included in the audit report, but unfortunately may not be able to comply fully with recommendation 1.1 because of a time lag between revising the indicators and reporting on past performance. Recommendation 1.1 states, "[AFR/SD should] ensure its performance indicators in the R4 prepared in 1999 are objective and clearly defined regarding what specific results are to be measured." The 1999 R4 will report on performance for 1998. We believe that it would not be appropriate for us to revise, after the fact, indicators used to measure performance

2

that occurred in 1998. Instead, we will follow recommendation 1.2 and clarify when necessary indicator ambiguity and data limitations.

There are two points of clarification necessary to the report language. First, standard Agency practice is to use the term "objectively verifiable" to describe strategic objectives and intermediate results, not indicators. We typically talk about indicators being objective, not objectively verifiable. This usage is reflected in both the ADS and the TIPS series. In the report, "objectively verifiable" is confused with "objective." Second, the TIPS series is not prescribed Agency policy. As stated in ADS chapter 203.6, "The TIPS do not represent mandated Agency policy or procedures." References in the report to the TIPS series suggest that the series is to be considered Agency policy, and thus must be followed. The substance of the report probably would not change with these corrections, but the inaccuracies could cause confusion and false conclusions.

Finally, there is one factual error in the report which may be the result of an incomplete sentence, but which should be corrected. Under the "Audit Findings" section, the first sentence of the first paragraph after the bold-faced question is not correct. The sentence begins, "Most indicators used by the Africa Bureau's Office of Sustainable Development did not report results data in its Results Review and Resource Request (R4) prepared in 1997 ...". The audit included only a sample of indicators, and for all of those indicators selected there were results reported. Beyond that, AFR/SD reported results for the overwhelming majority of indicators it used to measure performance in 1996, and those instances where it did not report results the indicators did not call for annual reporting. A correct statement to replace that which is in the report would be, "Of those indicators included in the audit sample, most (21 out of 25) did not meet the Agency's criteria for objective indicators, and some indicators (3) were either inaccurate or unsupported."

In sum, we appreciate the work that the auditors put into this effort, and will work to further improve our performance monitoring system based on their findings.

Clearance:
AFR/SD:DMcCloud *DM* date *11/6/98*

Federal Laws and Regulations, and USAID Guidance Relevant to Measuring Program Performance

There are numerous federal laws and regulations requiring USAID (and other federal agencies) to develop and implement internal management controls to measure and report on program performance. Discussed below are examples of those requirements, in addition to the Government Performance and Results Act, as well as related USAID policies and procedures.

Laws and Regulations

Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 requires management internal controls which provide for (1) complete, reliable, consistent, and timely information prepared on a uniform basis and responds to the financial information needs of agency management; and (2) the systematic measurement of performance.

Standards for Internal Controls in the Federal Government issued by the U.S. General Accounting Office in 1983 require systems of internal controls that ensure that all transactions and other significant events are to be clearly documented, and that the documentation be readily available for examination.

OMB Circular No. A-123 (dated June 21, 1995), which is the Executive Branch's implementing policy for compliance with the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982, requires agencies to have management internal controls to ensure that (1) programs achieve their intended results; and (2) reliable and timely information is obtained, maintained, reported and used for decision making.

OMB Bulletin 93-06 (dated January 8, 1993) requires agencies to have internal control systems to provide reasonable assurance that support for reported performance results are properly recorded and accounted for to permit preparation of reliable and complete performance information.

The Foreign Assistance Act (Section 621A), as amended in 1968, requires USAID to develop and implement a management system that provides for comparing actual results of programs and projects with those anticipated when they were undertaken. The system should provide information to USAID and to Congress that relates USAID resources, expenditures, and budget projections to program objectives and results in order to assist in the evaluation of program performance.

USAID Policies and Procedures

The most recent USAID system, known as the Automated Directives System for Managing for Results (ADS 200 Series), for measuring and reporting on program performance was initiated in October 1995. This new system requires (Section 203.5.1a) that operating units establish

performance monitoring systems to regularly collect and analyze data which will enable them to track performance and objectively report on the progress in achieving strategic objectives and intermediate results. The system also requires (Sections 203.5.5, 203.5.5e, E203.5.5 and 203.5.9a) operating units to:

- establish objective performance indicators (with related baseline data and targets) to measure progress in achieving program objectives;
- critically assess the performance data at regular intervals to ensure that reported performance data are of reasonable quality and accurately reflect performance; and
- prepare an annual Results Review and Resource Request (R4) report which must include performance information on progress in achieving its program objectives for the immediate past fiscal year.

TIPS No. 6 "Selecting Performance Indicators," which is supplemental guidance to the ADS, defines objective as:

An objective indicator has no ambiguity about what is being measured. That is, there is general agreement over interpretation of the results. It is both unidimensional and operationally precise. To be *unidimensional* means that it measures only one phenomenon at a time. . . . *Operational precision* means no ambiguity over what kind of data would be collected for an indicator. For example, while *number of successful export firms* is ambiguous, something like *number of export firms experiencing an annual increase in revenues of at least 5 percent* is operationally precise.

TIPS No. 7 "Preparing a Performance Monitoring Plan," which is also supplemental guidance to the ADS, stipulates that each performance indicator needs a detailed definition. The definition should be detailed enough to ensure that different people at different times, given the task of collecting data for a given indicator, would collect identical types of data. The definition should be precise about all technical elements of the indicator statement. For example, the TIPS states:

As an illustration, consider the indicator, *number of small enterprises receiving loans from the private banking system*. How are small enterprises defined -- all enterprises with 20 or fewer employees, or 50 or 100? What types of institutions are considered part of the private banking sector -- credit unions, government-private sector joint-venture financial institutions?

ADS Section E203.5.5 also requires operating units to (1) assess data quality as part of the process of establishing performance indicators and choosing data collection sources and methods; (2) collect results data for each performance indicator on a regular basis; and (3) reassess data quality as is necessary but at intervals of no greater than three years. These policies and

procedures also state that if data for a performance indicator prove to be unavailable or too costly to collect, the indicator may need to be changed.

In addition, ADS section 203.5.8c states that USAID will conduct a review of performance on an annual basis which will include analyzing operating units performance and "shall focus on the immediate past fiscal year," but may also review performance for prior years.

USAID guidance issued in January 1997 for preparing the R4s stated that the goal of the guidance was to generate R4s which ensure that USAID/Washington management has the information it needs to make results-based resource allocations among operating units and report on USAID's achievements. The guidance also stated that the most effective R4s are those that (1) assess performance over the life of objectives, with an emphasis on the past year, using established indicators, baseline data and targets; and (2) state explicitly whether and how much progress or results surpassed, met or fell short of expectations. The guidance stated that the results should cover actual performance through fiscal year 1996.

Analysis of the 1996 Indicators and Results Reviewed⁴
(as reflected in the R4 prepared in 1997)

Indicator Description (R4 Indicator)	Objectively Verifiable ?	Supported ?	Accurate ($\pm 1\%$) ?	Comments
No. of improved structural policies, programs and strategies for broad-based Economic Growth that are implemented by African Partners, donors, and USAID missions. (Economic Growth: Table 1)	No			R4 did not define or provide a baseline to objectively measure "improved" policies, etc., or "broad-based" economic growth, or the extent of implementation anticipated. The indicator also was not unidimensional because it attempts to measure three different conditions, "policies, programs, and strategies." In addition, the results related to assistance provided in FY 1996. The actual results occurred after January 1997.
New and focused Technology Development & Transfer (TDT) strategies and programs developed by USAID Missions consistent with TDT Strategic Framework. (Agriculture: Table 2)	No			R4 did not provide a definition to objectively measure "focused." The R4 narrative also used "missions" as the unit of measurement while the table used "organizations." Documentation provided did not relate to all of 1996 but only to two early months. The R4 did not identify what data sources would be used to document the achievements.

⁴ To avoid double counting the problems related to the reported results (e.g. report a result as both not supported and not accurate), we classified indicator results as having only one problem according to the following hierarchy: (1) not objectively verifiable, (2) not supported, (3) not accurate, and (4) not complete. We would, however, classify results as not validated (if applicable) in addition to another problem because we believe that the requirement for operating units to assess the quality of data sources was a distinct function and potentially related to each of the types of problems included in the hierarchy. We did not assess whether a result was validated if the result was not objectively verifiable.

APPENDIX IV

Page 2 of 7

Indicator Description (R4 Indicator)	Objectively Verifiable ?	Supported ?	Accurate ($\pm 1\%$) ?	Comments
Sustainable financing mechanisms and plans developed by national and regional organizations that include strategies to mobilize resources, and strengthen public and private collaboration. (Agriculture: Table 3)	No			R4 did not provide a definition to objectively measure "strengthen." The indicator also was not unidimensional because it attempted to measure two different conditions "mechanisms" and "plans." Only 2 of the 6 results occurred in 1996. Completion of the other 4 was postponed to 1997 at the earliest. The R4 narrative also used "organizations" as the unit of measurement while the table used "number of countries, and number and type of technologies." The R4 did not identify what data sources would be used to document the achievements.
Collaborative Regional Research Network programs established that build capacity and mechanisms to increase availability of and access to technology for high priority commodities and themes. (Agriculture: Table 5)	No			R4 did not provide a definition to objectively measure "high priority commodities and themes." The indicator also was not unidimensional because it attempted to measure two different program conditions—"capacity" and "mechanisms." The R4 narrative also used "programs" as the unit of measurement while the table used "organizations." The R4 did not identify what data sources would be used to document the achievements.
Best practices and strategies developed to facilitate trade and technology linkages and alliances. (Agriculture: Table 11)	No			R4 did not provide a definition to objectively measure "best." AFR/SD did not keep a record of the five specific achievements claimed in the R4 and relied on its support contractor to reconstruct the data we reviewed. AFR/SD did provide, however, data on 2 indicator-related achievements. The R4 did not identify what data sources would be used to document the achievements.
Program options for developing private sector policy dialogues and strategies for enterprise development and marketing efficiency. (Agriculture: Table 12)	No			This indicator was not unidimensional because it attempted to measure two different conditions: "dialogues" and "strategies." The R4 did not identify what data sources would be used to document the achievements.

APPENDIX IV

Page 3 of 7

Indicator Description (R4 Indicator)	Objectively Verifiable ?	Supported ?	Accurate (± 1%) ?	Comments
Countries and/or USAID missions adopt and/or implement national programs, policies or strategies to increase participation/remove constraints in commodity output markets. (Agriculture: Table 13)	No			This indicator was not unidimensional because it attempted to measure more than one condition, such as (a) "adopt" versus "implement," and (b) "increase participation" versus "remove constraints." It also overstated what USAID missions can do. For instance, USAID missions cannot adopt national programs. This result also was inaccurate because an international organization was incorrectly included as accomplishing the result when the measurement was countries or USAID missions. The R4 did not identify what data sources would be used to document the achievements.
Strategic planning established and implemented to marshal financial and marketing analytical skills to improve business plan implementation among Small & Medium Enterprises. (Agriculture: Table 15)	No			R4 did not provide a definition or baseline to objectively measure "improve." AFR/SD did not keep a record of the six specific achievements claimed in the R4 and relied on its support contractor to reconstruct the data we reviewed. AFR/SD did provide, however, data on 4 indicator-related achievements. The R4 did not identify what data sources would be used to document the achievements.
Mechanisms established to strengthen use of information technology subregionally focusing on accessing market information, appropriate technologies and joint venture trade opportunities. (Agriculture: Table 16)	No			R4 did not provide a definition or baseline to objectively measure "strengthen." Documentation did not support the five results claimed. Also, AFR/SD did not keep a record of which activities were claimed in the R4 and relied on its support contractor to reconstruct the data we reviewed. The documents provided did not support the achievements claimed. The R4 did not identify what data sources would be used to document the achievements.

Indicator Description (R4 Indicator)	Objectively Verifiable ?	Supported ?	Accurate ($\pm 1\%$) ?	Comments
Primary schools connected through low-cost, high quality internet services. (Education: Table 4)	No			R4 did not provide a definition or baseline to objectively measure "low-cost," "high quality," or how many schools would be connected. The indicator also should have defined "internet services," because the internet provides an array of services. The intended result of using internet services also was not achieved. The R4 did not identify what data sources would be used to document the achievements.
National Malaria Control Strategies Adopted and programs introduced. (Child Survival: Table 1)	No			The indicator was not unidimensional because it attempted to measure two different conditions: "strategies adopted" and "programs introduced." These should be separate indicators. Also, criteria had not been established on the extent programs had to be "introduced" to be counted as achieved.
New and Expanded Child Survival Programs developed by USAID. (Child Survival: Table 3)	No			The indicator was not unidimensional because it attempted to measure two different conditions: "new" and "expanded" programs. These should be separate indicators. The results include achievement before FY 1996, but the documentation did not identify when programs were achieved.
No. of countries introducing Integrated Management of Childhood Illness. (Child Survival: Table 4)	No			The R4 did not provide a definition to objectively measure "introduced."
Expanded family planning services in urban areas. (Family Planning: Table 1)	No			R4 did not provide a definition or baseline to objectively measure "expanded" services. Also, no documentation was provided to support the claimed result.
Private Sector AIDS Policy Presentation materials used in the private business sector. (HIV: Table 1)	No			This indicator was intended as an anecdotal indicator. The support was based on notes from an HIV conference in Africa.

Indicator Description (R4 Indicator)	Objectively Verifiable ?	Supported ?	Accurate ($\pm 1\%$) ?	Comments
Sexually Transmitted Infections/HIV/AIDS services integrated with Maternal and Child Health/Family Planning programs. (HIV: Table 4)	No			The R4 did not provide a definition to objectively measure "integrated." No documentation was provided to support the claimed result.
Removing barriers (creating an enabling environment) for private sector participation, provision, and financing of health care delivery. (Health Sector Reform: Table 1)	No			The definition provided for "barriers" was not objectively measurable because it included vague terms, such as "prohibitive," "restrictive," and "unrealistically high." These need further defining to be measured objectively. In addition, the barrier that was cited as removed was a law enacted on September 6, 1995 (FY 1995). Thus, this was not a FY 1996 achievement.
Public sector financing of private provision of public health care services. (Health Sector Reform: Table 2)	Yes	No		There was no evidence that the claimed achievement occurred. The documentary support, a feasibility study issued in December 1996, recommended public financing of public health care provided by the private sector. However, there was no commitment from the government to fund these activities in calendar year 1996.
Percentage of selected Missions' strategies, program assessments, etc. which contain lessons by AFR/SD's Productive Sector Growth & Environment Division (Note "Mission" includes countries without in-country operating units, managed by regional or central programs). (Environment & Natural Resources: Table 1)	No			This indicator was not unidimensional because it attempted to measure multiple conditions: "strategies," "program assessments," and "etc." The table's Indicator Description defines more specifically what conditions were to be counted. However, these conditions—strategies, programs or assessments—should be separate indicators under the unidimensional concept. AFR/SD also did not keep a record of the 27 specific 1996 results claimed in the R4, but provided data on 20 indicator-related achievements.

Indicator Description (R4 Indicator)	Objectively Verifiable ?	Supported ?	Accurate ($\pm 1\%$) ?	Comments
Percentage of selected Missions which compare actual and expected outcomes, conduct analyses and incorporate lessons into programming. (Environment & Natural Resources: Table 2)	Yes	No		AFR/SD did not keep a record of the 15 specific 1996 results claimed in the R4. Data was provided for 13 activities, but only 1 was for an achievement in FY 1996. Support for another 5 related to FY 1997, and support for 7 others did not clearly relate to USAID/Mission activities. The table's Indicator Description defined this indicator as having "an information management system aimed at identifying and using lessons learned."
Percentage of selected countries where "enabling" policies are passed or amended based on lessons from the field. (Environment & Natural Resources: Table 3)	No			R4 did not provide a definition or baseline to objectively measure "enabling." AFR/SD also did not keep a record of the 11 specific 1996 results claimed in the R4, and was able to provide data on only 3 indicator-related achievements.
(IR4/FY96) Number of countries which have National Environmental Action Plans (or national strategies) developed involving multi-donor support. (Environment & Natural Resources: Table 4)	No			R4 did not provide a definition to objectively measure "developed." Five of the 46 National Environmental Action Plans are draft documents with pending implementation dates of 1999 or 2000. The 41 others represent plans that were approved from 1988 through 1996. The R4 also did not state the achievements were cumulative from 1988.

APPENDIX IV

Page 7 of 7

Indicator Description (R4 Indicator)	Objectively Verifiable ?	Supported ?	Accurate (± 1%) ?	Comments
The tentative indicator is "implementation lessons incorporated into programs, policies, and strategies." In this R4, progress will be measured by three lower Results: A) [Environmental Management Capacity Building] workshops conducted and participants trained, B) number of African Fellows and other partners directly facilitated by [environmentally sound natural resources management], C) Numbers of African institutions supported. (Environment & Natural Resources: Table 5)	Yes	Yes	No	According to the R4, 33 Non Governmental Organizations/Private & Voluntary Organizations/host country agencies were represented in the FY 1996 workshops which included 150 participants. The supporting documentation shows 45 Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs), et al. were represented, and 119 people participated. The R4 underreported the number of NGOs, et al., were represented by 36 percent, and over stated the number of participants by 26 percent. Of the three lower results mentioned in the indicator as measurements, only result "A" had a FY 1996 measurement.
Formal macro Democracy & Governance strategic assessment framework applied by Africa Bureau missions. (Democracy & Governance: Table 1)	Yes	Yes	Yes	
African capacity to conduct strategic democracy and governance self-evaluations developed. (Democracy & Governance: Table 5)	No			R4 did not provide a definition or baseline to objectively measure "capacity developed."
Total Negative Responses	21	2	1	